

The North Carolina Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY
WILLIAM W. HOLDEN,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION OF THE STATES—THEY "MUST BE PRESERVED."

RALPH, N. C., WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1846.

VOLUME XII.—NUMBER 594.
TERMS—\$3 PER ANNUM,
PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

TERMS.

THE NORTH CAROLINA STANDARD

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT

THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM—IN ADVANCE.

Those persons who remit by Mail (postage paid) Five Dollars, will be entitled to a receipt for Six Dollars or two years' subscription to the Standard—one copy two years, or two copies one year.

For four copies, : : : \$10 00
" ten " : : : : : 20 00
" twenty " : : : : : 35 00

The same rate for six months.

Any person procuring and forwarding five subscribers with the cash (\$15.) will be entitled to the Standard one year free of charge.

Advertisements not exceeding fourteen lines, will be inserted one time for One Dollar, and twenty-five cents for each subsequent insertion;—those of greater length, in proportion. Court Orders and Judicial Advertisements will be charged twenty-five per cent higher than the above rates. A deduction of 10 per cent will be made to those who advertise by the year. If the number of insertions be not marked on them, they will be continued until ordered out. Letters to the Editor must come free of postage, or they may not be attended to.

SPEECH OF MR. REID, OF NORTH CAROLINA,

In the House of Representatives, Feb. 7, 1846—
On the Resolution of notice to Great Britain to
abrogate the convention of joint occupancy relative
to the Oregon territory.

Mr. REID obtained the floor, and addressed the committee as follows:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The importance of the question under consideration must plead my apology for trespassing on the patience of this House, while I give some of the considerations which will influence the vote I intend to give. Could I cherish the vanity that I could, at any time, have enlightened this body on any topic of legislation before it, such a hope would be utterly vain on this occasion, after the question before the House has undergone so full and able a discussion.

The question under consideration is, whether it is proper, at this time, to give the notice to Great Britain that the conventions of 1818 and 1827, touching what is generally termed the joint occupancy by the two governments of the Oregon territory, should terminate at the expiration of twelve months. I believe that we have a good title to Oregon. We have acquired title to it by settlement and discovery; and if anything was wanted to make it complete, that was supplied by the acquisition of the claims of France and Spain. But I did not rise to discuss the title at this time; that task has already been performed with an ability which has satisfied the country. I must confess that I was astonished to hear the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Davis] take the ground that the constitution had transferred the power of giving such notice to the President of the United States; and that the executive had endeavored to avoid that responsibility by throwing it on the legislative department of this government. Surely the gentleman did not listen to the able speech of the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. Thurman.]

What is a treaty? It is the supreme law of the land, and can only be abrogated by an act of Congress, or by another treaty made in conformity to the constitution. And can the gentleman from Kentucky desire that the President shall take into his own hands the prerogative of abrogating a supreme law of the land? If the Executive himself should claim such a power, how would the cry of usurpation ring from one end of the country to the other? He would be charged with an attempt to violate the constitution, and seize upon despotic power. The whole country would condemn such a course, and I fancy that even the gentleman from Kentucky, and his political friends, would raise the cry of usurpation! If the gentleman thinks that the notice is a war measure, and equivalent to a declaration of war, as some have insisted, then surely he will not assert that the President has power to give it without the legislative action of this government. The gentleman thought proper to deprecate the idea of connecting this question with the party politics of the day; but he departed from this course by heaping partisan abuse upon the President, and charging on him a design of involving the country in a war without consulting its welfare.

Does the gentleman believe that the interests of the country required the President to make the British government a more liberal offer than he did? If not, then, how could he charge the President with an attempt to plunge the country into an unjust and unnecessary war? For myself, I believe that it was too liberal; but we have been informed that it was refused, and withdrawn, and our title asserted to the whole of Oregon. Some of the gentleman's political friends say that "the President cannot be kicked into a war;" while the gentleman himself insists that the President is too anxious for war. Whether the gentleman has met this question in the elevated spirit of a statesman, I leave to this House and to the country to judge.

I know not, sir, whether the giving of this notice will produce war; I am sure that it will not be a just cause of war; but I deny that it is a war measure. It ought not to be so considered here, for it is not so regarded even in Great Britain. The giving of the notice is provided for in the convention of 1827; it is peaceable in its character, and does not prevent negotiation; but still so fruitful are the imaginations of some gentlemen that they cannot speak of it in any other light than as a war measure. The friends of this measure have not advocated it as a war measure; it has only been so characterized by those who oppose it.

In giving the notice, the only legitimate inquiry for an American statesman is, whether this question ought to be settled as early as practicable, or delayed for an indefinite period of time. The convictions of my mind are decidedly in favor of the former course. Let us examine this point. For the purpose of postponing the adjustment of the Oregon dispute, it was agreed in the third article of the convention between the United States and Great Britain, signed October 20, 1818, that

"Any country that may be claimed by either party on the northwest coast of America westward of the Stony mountains, (now called Rocky mountains,) shall, together with its harbors, bays, and creeks, and the navigation of all rivers within the same, be free and open for the term of ten years from the date of the signature of the present convention, to the vessels, citizens, and subjects of the two powers; it being well understood that this agreement is not to be construed to the prejudice of any claim which either of the two high contracting parties may have to any part of said country, nor shall it be taken to affect the claims of any other power or State to any part of said country, the only object of the high contracting parties, in

that respect, being to prevent disputes and differences among themselves."

This convention remained in force till it was renewed by the convention signed at London, August 6, 1827, which provided:

"ART. 1. All the provisions of the third article of the convention concluded between the United States of America and his Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, on the 20th day of Oct., 1818, shall be, and they are hereby, further indefinitely extended and continued in force, in the same manner as if all the provisions of the said article were herein specifically recited.

"ART. 2. It shall be competent, however, for either of the contracting parties, in case either should think fit, at any time after the 20th October, 1828, on giving due notice of twelve months to the other contracting party, to annul and abrogate this convention; and it shall, in such case, be accordingly entirely annulled and abrogated, after the expiration of the said term of notice.

"ART. 3. Nothing contained in this convention or in the third article of the convention of the 20th October, 1818, hereby continued in force, shall be construed to impair, or in any manner affect, the claims which either of the contracting parties may have to any part of the country westward of the Stony or Rocky mountains."

From 1818, up to the present time, repeated efforts have been made to settle by negotiation the dispute between the two countries in regard to this territory; but Great Britain has always refused to propose such terms as this country could accept, without a sacrifice of her rights. In this condition the question stands at the present moment; and it might so remain, but for the change of circumstances which will in a short time render it both impracticable and impossible. While the country was only used for hunting, fishing, and fur trading, there was but little difficulty between the two governments in relation to their conflicting claims, and it was not indispensably necessary to adjust them. But things have changed. Within a few years thousands of our industrious and enterprising citizens have gone with their families to that country to engage in agricultural, mechanical, and other pursuits of civilized life, and they are now cultivating the soil, and earning for themselves permanent homes, and an inheritance for their children. Does any one suppose that we have arrived at such perfection in the science of government as to justify the hope that two distinct races of people, each governed by a different code of laws, and owing allegiance to governments totally differing in their character, can settle and occupy the same territory, and maintain peaceable relations towards each other? Such a hope is illusory. Why then should we in further delay, when every moment we are giving up territory to our neighbor? When a dispute arises between two neighbors as to the boundary of their lands, the dispute may often be easily adjusted at first; but if they once drive their houses, cut their ditches, and build their houses on the disputed territory, a friendly settlement of the boundary becomes almost impossible. So it will be in regard to Oregon. This territory is now regarded as greatly more valuable than it was in 1818; and if you wait ten years longer, its estimation will no doubt be more than quadrupled. Is it not important, then, that this question should be settled as early as practicable? In view of all this, I ask, is it not our duty to take such measures as will facilitate the decision of this question? For one, I believe the country is ours to 54 deg. 40 min., but the extent of our title is not the question now under consideration; and all who believe that we have rights in Oregon, no matter to what extent, so they be greater than the British government has offered to concede, ought to vote for this measure.

The President of the United States, in his annual message at the opening of the present session of Congress, says:

"The extraordinary and wholly inadmissible demands of the British government, and the rejection of the proposition made in deference alone to what had been done by my predecessors, and the implied obligations which their acts seemed to impose, afford satisfactory evidence that no compromise which the United States ought to accept can be effected. With this conviction, the proposition of compromise, which had been made and rejected, was, by my direction, subsequently withdrawn, and our title to the whole Oregon territory asserted, and as is believed, maintained by irrefragable facts and arguments.

"The civilized world will see in these proceedings, a spirit of liberal concession on the part of the United States; and this government will be relieved from all responsibility which may follow the failure to settle the controversy.

All attempts at compromise having failed, it becomes the duty of Congress to consider what measures it may be proper to adopt for the security and protection of our citizens now inhabiting, or who may hereafter inhabit Oregon, and for the maintenance of our just title to that territory. In adopting measures for this purpose, care should be taken that nothing be done to violate the stipulations of the convention of 1827, which is still in force. The faith of treaties, in their letter and spirit, has ever been, and I trust, will ever be, scrupulously observed by the United States. Under that convention, a year's notice is required to be given by either party to the other, before the joint occupancy shall terminate, and before either can rightfully assert or exercise exclusive jurisdiction over any portion of the territory. This notice it would, in my judgment, be proper to give; and I recommend that provision be made by law for giving it accordingly, and terminating, in this manner, the convention of the sixth of August, 1827."

Now, sir, in the face of these facts, can we shrink from giving the notice? Some gentlemen take it for granted that this measure will cut off all negotiation; but they are mistaken. It only carries out what public opinion has declared, and what the true policy of the country requires. If further negotiation shall be necessary or proper, then this notice in no wise prevents it; if further negotiation is unnecessary or improper, it is our imperative duty to give the notice. Passing this measure, then, will not prevent our government from doing anything that ought to be done, while it will unite our hands and leave us free to pursue such measures as the interests of the country demand. In doing these things, we must observe our national faith, and violate no treaty stipulation. At the last session of Congress, a bill to organize a Territorial government in Oregon passed this House by a vote of 140 to 59. This bill contained a section providing for the giving of the notice, in the following words:

"Sec. 43. And be it further enacted, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, required to cause due notice to be given to the British government of the desire and intention of the government of the United States to annul and abrogate the convention with Great Britain relative to territory on the northwest coast of America,

concluded August 6, 1827, agreeably to the provisions of the 2d article of that convention: Provided, that nothing in this act contained shall be so construed or carried into effect by any of the officers or citizens of the United States, as to interfere in any way with any right which any of the subjects of Great Britain may have in the territory herein mentioned, as provided for in the convention aforesaid, until the expiration of twelve months after notice shall be given, as above provided, by the President of the United States."

Sir, I voted for this bill then, as did a very large majority of the members of the House, but it did not pass the Senate. Was it considered a war measure then? No, sir; and why should it be considered so now? Without a knowledge of the views of my constituents, I voted for the bill then, and they sustained me; but in giving the same vote now, I not only believe that I am doing right, but feel sure that I am obeying the will of those who sent me here. I repudiate the idea that this is a war measure. It is merely proof of our anxiety to settle the question, and of our determination to maintain our rights in that territory, and repel those who trespass on them. But while I repeat that this is no war measure, I would not be understood as saying that this country will not take such further steps as may be necessary to secure our rights in Oregon. The territory is ours, and we must not part with it. Sir, the time has ceased with us when we can act in that spirit of forbearance to Great Britain which characterized the conduct of the patriarch Abraham, when he said to Lot, "If thou wilt take the left hand, then I will go to the right; and if thou depart to the right hand, then I will go to the left." That might have been possible once when very little value was attached to territory. But not so now with us. We need all the territory we have, and ought not under any circumstances to part with any portion that we possess. But highly as we prize territory, we do not propose to take any that does not belong to us.

Sir, I am a rare some gentlemen, who do not appreciate the importance of Oregon, represent it as a distant strip of land of but little value; and they ask, are we going to fight for that? I tell such gentlemen that Oregon is of vast importance to this country; and that its loss would be deeply felt and sorely regretted to the latest moment of the existence of this great republic? Because Oregon is at a great distance from this Capitol, shall we treat her as the Roman empire once treated the island of Britain—clip her off, and tell her to take care of herself? Britain was once a part of the Roman empire; but when that government thought her of so little value that they cast her off, and told the people if they could defend themselves against their enemies, good and well, let them do it; the Roman eagle would no longer take them under its wings. On this strip of country, thus severed—which is infinitely smaller than Oregon—is planted that mighty government, whose invincibility has this day been so eloquently described! It is the nation inhabiting this territory which now struggles for the conquest of the world, and carries terror with her name to the most distant parts of the earth? This teaches us the increasing importance of territory, and is a warning to us to guard against the loss of any part of our country, or of any portion of our people. It is quite natural for us to suppose, that under any circumstances, Oregon is destined to be a part of our confederacy, but it may perhaps turn out otherwise. I here express the hope, and cherish the belief, that she will never be a British colony; that that country will be a republic, inhabited by freemen, I believe almost certain; but whether she is destined to remain a part of this confederacy, or to become a separate and distinct republic, depends upon the policy pursued towards her by this government. If we now refuse her protection, may she not hereafter scorn our proffer of reunion and refuse to be received by us as a State? The case of Texas was different. Texas was a distinct and independent nation, and we were under no obligations to protect her people or territory till she became a part of this Union. But we are under very different obligations to the people of Oregon, because we own the territory, and it is settled by our own citizens. If we leave her in the moment of her struggles to shift for herself by withdrawing our protection, will she hereafter, when she has established her right to the soil, come and ask to be again incorporated into this Union? I believe not. I must here remark that I would be the last man on this floor, or in this country, to claim a single inch of territory which I did not believe to be ours; but, on the other hand, I say with equal determination that I will never consent to the surrender of an inch that is our own—I care not where it lies, or what may be its value—to gratify the ambition of Great Britain or any other government upon the earth. We boast of being a great and glorious republic; but what constitutes a great government? It is the justice of its laws—the preservation of its rights—and the protection of its citizens. I care not how wealthy or powerful a nation may be; as soon as she ceases to preserve her rights and to protect her citizens she ceases to be great and is destined to fall. If we ever surrender any portion of our territory to Great Britain, gentlemen may rest assured that it will be but the beginning of surrenders; she will never be satisfied with demanding. Peace is our policy. We do not seek a war with Great Britain; but if she declares war against us for defending our right to Oregon, we shall stand justified in the eyes of the world, and every American heart, and every American arm will be found on the side of their country. Sir, the country is in favor of notice, and for maintaining our right to the territory. Even in North Carolina Oregon is stronger than any political party; and, as an evidence of this, I will refer to the fact that my whig colleague from Lumber river, [Mr. Dockery] publicly proclaimed during the canvass, that, before he would surrender any part of Oregon, he would march barefoot over prickly pears to fight for it. I repeat that the "Old North State" is for Oregon.

Mr. DOCKERY rose, and asked his colleague to give him leave to explain. His colleague [Mr. Reid] knew more of the geography of his State than to speak of him as his colleague from Lumber River district. The remark to which the gentleman alluded was, that he was ready to contend for all to which we had a valid title. I said that there were in Oregon British rights and American rights; and that, when the line was run, I would defend our soil to the utmost extremity; and what he had said about marching over prickly pears to fight for it, that connection. He had said that, when our rights were determined, then he would march barefoot over prickly pears.

Mr. REID. Where does my colleague think our rights extend to?

Mr. DOCKERY. Just where the gentleman's

favorite President settled it in his negotiations. [A laugh.]

Mr. REID. Then the gentleman is with the President, and the President says, "our title to the whole of Oregon has been asserted, and, as is believed, maintained by irrefragable facts and arguments." The gentleman's location arose from this connection: him and myself were members of the legislature at the same time; he had a favorite project for the improvement of Lumber river; and from his zeal in favor of the measure, he became associated in my mind with the name of the river, so that I thought Lumber river certainly must run through his district. [A laugh.]

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman mistakes the nature of my patriotism. He thinks that a man's patriotism must be confined to his own district. Now, I am willing to improve North Carolina in any part of it; and just so I feel in regard to the United States.

Mr. REID resumed. I am happy to hear of the gentleman's patriotism, and I shall be still more so, if, when it comes to the vote, he shall show that his patriotism, which has already reached Lumber river, is found sufficiently expanded to extend to Oregon! I hope that we shall look on this as a great national question. My feelings are with the South—my destiny is with her's; but I will suffer no local or sectional views to influence my course on this important measure. It was with extreme reluctance that I heard the remark made by a member on this floor, that whatever might be the fate of this question, he should have the consolation to know that he had not followed in the lead of the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. Adams] I regret that it should be thought necessary to invoke existing prejudices against an individual to operate against a great national measure.

But, sir, in reply to that remark, I might, with equal propriety, say that we who support the notice will have the consolation to know that we are not following in the lead of Great Britain. But such a declaration would not be an argument for or against the notice. It has been said that the member from Ohio [Mr. Giddings] is for the notice, and that he is actuated by motives unworthy of a statesman. But even this shall not deter me from giving my vote for a measure which I believe to be right. I might as well be told, because one of the chosen twelve was a traitor, and betrayed the Saviour, that therefore I must reject Christianity. I follow in the lead of no man. I go for my country. We are told that we must not act at a war ensue. Has it come to this that our government can carry out no important measures connected with her domestic or foreign policy without the cry of war being raised and held up as a terror over us? War and ruin panics have alternately prevailed ever since the commencement of our government, and if we wait for them to cease before we act we shall never do anything. If we attempt to procure indemnity for spoliation on the property of our citizens by a foreign country, the war cry is raised—if we attempt to annex Texas, war in all its horrors is depicted as the consequence!—and when we attempt to assert our claim to Oregon, we are told an unjust and sanguinary war will be inevitable! The horrors of war have been described in so vivid and forcible a manner that one might almost imagine that they saw the British steamers darting from point to point along our coast—that they heard the thundering of British cannon, and beheld our cities with their temples of justice and their temples of religion wrapt in flames! But in the midst of this gloomy picture, the reflection rises in my mind, that whatever may have been the devastating effects of past wars, it is nevertheless certain a portion of mankind are so constituted that they grieve much about wars that never happen; and such, I hope, is the character of the lamentations of the gentlemen we have heard on this occasion. I am for peace; I love peace; I appreciate its effects upon commerce; and, above all, I admire its happy influences in a moral and political point of view. But while I say this, I must be permitted to remark, that I would at the sacrifice of the interests and the honor of my country. The territory claimed by Great Britain on this continent, is greater in extent than our own with Oregon included; and ought we to surrender to that government any portion of our soil? No, sir; we have none to spare. It has been with deep regret that I have heard remarks on this floor more disparaging to our claim to Oregon than anything that I have ever seen in the correspondence of the British minister himself. It has always been unfortunate for this country that in all of her controversies with foreign governments, sentiments have been uttered here which were calculated to mislead other countries in relation to the state of public opinion in the United States, and thereby to render the subject of dispute the more difficult to adjust. Such, I fear, will be the case in the present controversy. Sir, it is time we had learned to stand on our own feet. Great Britain is, year after year, by the force of her diplomacy, and the power of her sword, bringing nation after nation to bow to power and dominion, until her possessions dot your map over a considerable portion of the globe. With our love of liberty, we could not withhold our sympathy from those whose misfortune it has been, from time to time, to fall within her grasp; but we have stood by and beheld all these things in silence, adhering to the policy not to interfere in foreign disputes in which our own safety does not require us to take part. But when she comes upon our own shores, and seeks to possess herself of a part of our territory, every consideration of interest and of patriotism requires that we should resist her arrogant demands in the spirit of freemen who know their rights, and dare maintain them. If the preservation of our rights did not require it, such a course would then be absolutely necessary even to command the respect of Great Britain herself. In all the pictures that have been drawn of the horrid results of war, gentlemen have taken it for granted that we are to bear all the loss and make all the sacrifices, and that Great Britain has nothing to lose. But such is not the fact. Disastrous as such a conflict might prove to us, she has more to fear from it than ourselves. She cannot but foresee that the prosecution of a war against the United States would lead to a dismemberment of nearly all of her colonial possessions, and, perhaps, ultimately to an entire dissolution of her form of government. She has her domestic feuds and her immense debt; she has a commerce to suffer as well as ourselves; and the loss of our trade will injure her more than the loss of her trade can injure us. The defenceless condition of the United States has been frequently alluded to; and the gentleman from Alabama, [Mr. Yancy] said that there

were perhaps no United States soldiers in his own State at this time. I learned almost my first lesson on this Oregon question from that

gentleman. At the last session of Congress he sent to this House a resolution, passed by her legislature, in the following words:

Resolved, That the true policy of the United States requires that England should cease; and resolved, that the title of the United States to the territory of Oregon is clear and indisputable.

This was the language of that gallant State one year ago. But sir, Alabama has soldiers—citizen soldiers—the best in the world. Let the British soldier set his foot on Alabama's consecrated soil, and then we shall see where the soldiers are. Sir, "it takes time to discipline the slaves of despotism, but every man is a soldier when he combats tyranny." Our policy forbids the keeping of large standing armies in the time of peace, but we depend on our citizen soldiery, who are the safest reliance. Sound the alarm that the invaders are at hand, and the question will not be whom can you urge to meet them, but whom can you hold back from the conflict? Tell me not of the want of soldiers to defend our country. Our citizen soldiers fight, not for pay, but for the rights of their country; and when they have achieved the victory their patriotism deserves, they lay aside their armor—they put off their martial character and retire to the bosom of their families, and tell their deeds to inspire the rising generation with the same patriotic ardor. These, Mr. Chairman, are our soldiers, and they will be found equal to any emergency. Let not Great Britain calculate on disensions among ourselves, for when the first blow shall be struck, whether it be in the North or in the South, all local distinctions will be forgotten. We shall alone remember that we are citizens of the same republic; and the South will be ready to fly to the rescue of the North, and the North will be found defending the institutions and the rights of the South. But it has been said that our navy is not so large as that of Great Britain. It is true that she has a large navy, and numbers us in steamships; but it is equally true that our situation is infinitely better than it was at the commencement of the war. Our navy is now

greater, and the facilities for commanding them vastly increased. The efficiency of the British navy has been greatly exaggerated. She has laid out millions in building fleets which the improvements in modern warfare have rendered next to useless. These improvements are constantly going on, and have already reached a point which renders a large portion of the vast navy of Great Britain on which she has lavished such immense sums utterly unavailable in a war with the United States. If we need fleets we can build them; and it is better for us that we have not exhausted our resources in the construction of a large navy, which would now be unfit for service. During the last war our gallant little navy won for herself enduring fame; and I undertake to say that when the emergency shall again arise, she will fully maintain that high character to which her noble deeds so justly entitle her. In conclusion, permit me to remark, that while I respect the opinions, and do not arraign the motives of those who differ from me on this question, no act of mine shall ever sanction the surrender of any portion of our territory, without a just equivalent. Entertaining the opinions I do, if I were to act otherwise, I should feel that I had not faithfully performed the high and responsible duty which I owe to my constituents, and to my country. Let us pass the notice, and follow it up by giving bounties of land to such of our citizens as may go there to brave the hardships and privations of a frontier life. Let us extend the laws and protection of the United States over that territory. Do these things, and my word for it, these brave pioneers will do much towards protecting themselves. We shall then prove to the world that we regard the great principle that the protection of our laws shall extend to every citizen of the republic, and that we are determined that our rights shall be respected all over the earth. It is natural that there should exist among a free people, some differences of opinion as to the best mode of accomplishing any end; but on this great question, let us present to England, to Europe, and to the world an undivided front, and this will ensure us peace, if peace is attainable.

A Contrast. Two lads stood on a bank of snow in front of one of the beautiful houses in Pemberton Square. One of them might have been 14 or 16 years old, and the other had not seen above half that number of years. They were musicians. The larger boy was turning the crank of a small street organ, and his little brother was beating, with great energy and precision, a small tamborine. Though decently clad, they were evidently the children of poverty. At the window of the drawing room, in front of which the little musicians stood, was a beautiful lute boy, whose auburn ringlets hung in rich profusion over his delicate shoulders, and whose tasteful and elegant dress denoted the influence of his parents. And now, thought we, what a contrast is here! The poor, shivering boys on the snow drift, playing with the hope of a few coppers for the amusement of the fair boy in the warm and elegant parlor. But, who can tell that a greater contrast may not yet be exhibited by these same three boys? Who can foretell the future history of either? Would it be extravagant to suppose it possible, that the poor strivling musicians, who now pick up a scanty living by their daily round of toil, may become the proprietors of mansions as lofty and elegant as those before which they are now soliciting alms; while the child of luxury, who has never known the want of any good thing that wealth can give, and on whose fair form the winds of Heaven have never rudely blown, shall become a homeless and penniless wanderer? The history of our city presents many examples of change quite as remarkable as this would be. Indeed, the whole history of our country is replete with such contrasts. The children of wealthy parents, left with fortunes, have become poor and friendless, while the very servants of their fathers' houses have become men of wealth and distinction. Let not then the rich despise the poor, nor the poor envy the rich; for they may yet change places. And further, let rich men so educate their children that if wealth should take to itself wings and fly away, there may be some preparation on their part to meet the privations and hardships of poverty.

Boston Traveller.

Wonderful. The Richmond Star says another relic of the classic ages was found in that city, being a dog collar supposed to have belonged to Julius Cæsar, from the fact of having his name engraved upon it.

of the company, consisting of eight men and 5 women, was sent out to Russellville, Hopkinsville and Clarksville, under my management. While performing the 'Stranger' at Clarksville, one of our auditors became so interested in the last scene, that he got up and addressed my brother as follows:—'Come, Smith, look over what's past, and take back your wife, for I'll be d—d if you'll get such another in a hurry!'

This reminds me of a similar effect produced by the performance of the 'Gambler's Fate' in Huntsville, several years afterwards. During the last scene of that most thrilling drama, where Albert Germaine and his family are represented in a state of actual starvation, a country gentleman in one of the side boxes suddenly rose up, and said, 'I cannot stand this, in a voice loud enough to be heard all over the house. 'Gentlemen, I propose we make up something for this woman.' He was here admonished by certain 'hushes,' 'set downs,' and 'orders,' that his proposition did not meet with much favor—in the contrary it was received with considerable laughter, while a whispered intimation came to his ear from a friend at his elbow, that the distress of the family was all sham! 'Gentlemen, continued the charitable country auditor, you may 'hush,' and 'order' as much as you please—for my part I don't see anything to laugh at; you see the woman hasn't anything to eat, and that poor little child of hers seems almost famished; now I wouldn't give the rascal, her husband, the first red cent he does't deserve any pity; but really the woman hasn't deserved this distress; she has followed her husband through all his wanderings, and left her friends, where she was comfortable, to follow this scamp. 'Gentlemen, you may laugh, but here goes my V!' And sure enough, he threw a pocket book. 'There, my good woman—Mrs. Germaine, or what ever your name may be, take that! Send for something to eat and make yourself comfortable; but let me advise you, when you see her husband next, something about

with, as sure as h—ll and now continued the philanthropist, setting himself in his seat, now go on with the play!'

Death of a Sporting Clergyman. The Rev. Hardy M. Croyer, of Sumner county, Tenn., died on the 8th inst. He was buried with full Masonic honors. The deceased was a good man, but very eccentric. He is well known in the West for his connection with blooded horses, about which he wrote much and well. In England, he would have been a keen sporting parson, fond of fox-hunting and race horses—and perhaps none the worse Christian for that. He enjoyed a reputation for benevolence and uprightness, and possessed a vast variety of curious information, professional and miscellaneous.

A friend tells a characteristic anecdote of the parson, which is worthy of mention. He owned a fine race horse in conjunction with a celebrated and successful turfman and trainer, and when the fact was made known to his parishioners, they made enquiry as to its truth, and the charge was brought home to him. At a meeting of the elders the reverend gentleman was called before them to exculpate himself from the heinous offence of running a horse in a race. Feeling that it would be idle to put his defence upon the rational ground of the morality and utility of racing—a defence which he was very competent to make with ingenuity and force—he made up his mind to "confess and avoid," as the lawyers say. Accordingly he addressed them thus: "It's true, gentlemen, Tom Watson and I do own Jake Creath together—and he's not a bad horse either—when he starts he wins. Old man Watson trains and runs him at his own expense—I get half his winnings, because I allow my half of the horse to run with Col. Tom's half goes. If you will provide a way for my half to remain in the stable during the race, I am perfectly willing to retire from the turf!"

Whether the elders were convinced by this logic, or were mollified by his having named the horse after the Rev. Jacob Creath, a celebrated preacher, we know not; but he was not dismissed from his charge.

Louis Philippe. When teaching French and Dancing at a Boarding School, near Newtown, Bucks County, a friend narrates to the Courier that he conceived the idea of manufacturing Bologna sausages, and accordingly purchased a quantity of beef and ham, and with the assistance of a colored man, made up a lot of the article, packed, and forwarded them to France. This fact was incidentally furnished by an old lady now in the city, who then lived in the neighborhood, remarking that she knew how to make good Bologna sausages—and being asked where she obtained the recipe, replied, "from Louis Philippe."

He lived, at the time, with an accomplished and beautiful woman, supposed by all to be his wife—but on his return to France, he wrote to the lady with whom he boarded that she was not his wife.

In his use of ten, of which he was extravagantly fond, instead of cream he used Holland gin—but we sincerely trust that no body, not even those lesser or greater than "The Citizen King," will do themselves so great a wrong as to imitate his spiritual propensity in this regard, or in his domestic arrangements in the sweet village of Newtown.

Singular Masonic Fact. In an address lately delivered by Past Grand Master R. G. Scott before the Grand Lodge of Virginia, we met with the following statement:

"From sources of information on which I entirely rely, I state the fact, that fifty at least of those who signed the Declaration of Independence were Masons, and the same history informs us that every Major General of the Revolutionary army was a Mason save one, and that one was Benedict Arnold."

Charleston News.

sol. Smith. The following quotation touches upon the interest of the audience, in one of Sol's mimic scenes:

"Towards the close of the season, a branch of the company, consisting of eight men and 5 women, was sent out to Russellville, Hopkinsville and Clarksville, under my management. While performing the 'Stranger' at Clarksville, one of our auditors became so interested in the last scene, that he got up and addressed my brother as follows:—'Come, Smith, look over what's past, and take back your wife, for I'll be d—d if you'll get such another in a hurry!'

This reminds me of a similar effect produced by the performance of the 'Gambler's Fate' in Huntsville, several years afterwards. During the last scene of that most thrilling drama, where Albert Germaine and his family are represented in a state of actual starvation, a country gentleman in one of the side boxes suddenly rose up, and said, 'I cannot stand this, in a voice loud enough to be heard all over the house. 'Gentlemen, I propose we make up something for this woman.' He was here admonished by certain 'hushes,' 'set downs,' and 'orders,' that his proposition did not meet with much favor—in the contrary it was received with considerable laughter, while a whispered intimation came to his ear from a friend at his elbow, that the distress of the family was all sham! 'Gentlemen, continued the charitable country auditor, you may 'hush,' and 'order' as much as you please—for my part I don't see anything to laugh at; you see the woman hasn't anything to eat, and that poor little child of hers seems almost famished; now I wouldn't give the rascal, her husband, the first red cent he does't deserve any pity; but really the woman hasn't deserved this distress; she has followed her husband through all his wanderings, and left her friends, where she was comfortable, to follow this scamp. 'Gentlemen, you may laugh, but here goes my V!' And sure enough, he threw a pocket book. 'There, my good woman—Mrs. Germaine, or what ever your name may be, take that! Send for something to eat and make yourself comfortable; but let me advise you, when you see her husband next, something about

with, as sure as h—ll and now continued the philanthropist, setting himself in his seat, now go on with the play!'

Death of a Sporting Clergyman. The Rev. Hardy M. Croyer, of Sumner county, Tenn., died on the 8th inst. He was buried with full Masonic honors. The deceased was a good man, but very eccentric. He is well known in the West for his connection with blooded horses, about which he wrote much and well. In England, he would have been a keen sporting parson, fond of fox-hunting and race horses—and perhaps none the worse Christian for that. He enjoyed a reputation for benevolence and uprightness, and possessed a vast variety of curious information, professional and miscellaneous.

A friend tells a characteristic anecdote of the parson, which is worthy of mention. He owned a fine race horse in conjunction with a celebrated and successful turfman and trainer, and when the fact was made known to his parishioners, they made enquiry as to its truth, and the charge was brought home to him. At a meeting of the elders the reverend gentleman was called before them to exculpate himself from the heinous offence of running a horse in a race. Feeling that it would be idle to put his defence upon the rational ground of the morality and utility of racing—a defence which he was very competent to make with ingenuity and force—he made up his mind to "confess and avoid," as the lawyers say. Accordingly he addressed them thus: "It's true, gentlemen, Tom Watson and I do own Jake Creath together—and he's not a bad horse either—when he starts he wins. Old man Watson trains and runs him at his own expense—I get half his winnings, because I allow my half of the horse to run with Col. Tom's half goes. If you will provide a way for my half to remain in the stable during the race, I am perfectly willing to retire from the turf!"

Whether the elders were convinced by this logic, or were mollified by his having named the horse after the Rev. Jacob Creath, a celebrated preacher, we know not; but he was not dismissed from his charge.

Louis Philippe. When teaching French and Dancing at a Boarding School, near Newtown, Bucks County, a friend narrates to the Courier that he conceived the idea of manufacturing Bologna sausages, and accordingly purchased a quantity of beef and ham, and with the assistance of a colored man, made up a lot of the article, packed, and forwarded them to France. This fact was incidentally furnished by an old lady now in the city, who then lived in the neighborhood, remarking that she knew how to make good Bologna sausages—and being asked where she obtained the recipe, replied, "from Louis Philippe."

He lived, at the time, with an accomplished and beautiful woman, supposed by all to be his wife—but on his return to France, he wrote to the lady with whom he boarded that she was not his wife.

In his use of ten, of which he was extravagantly fond, instead of cream he used Holland gin—but we sincerely trust that no body, not even those lesser or greater than "The Citizen King," will do themselves so great a wrong as to imitate his spiritual propensity in this regard, or in his domestic arrangements in the sweet village of Newtown.

Singular Masonic Fact. In an address lately delivered by Past Grand Master R. G. Scott before the Grand Lodge of Virginia, we met with the following statement:

"From sources of information on which I entirely rely, I state the fact, that fifty at least of those who signed the Declaration of Independence were Masons, and the same history informs us that every Major General of the Revolutionary army was a Mason save one, and that one was Benedict Arnold."